Bay-Delta Sport Fishing Enhancement Stamp Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2006, 10:00 am – 1:00 pm
Fisheries Branch Office
830 S Street, Sacramento

Attendees

Jim Crenshaw, Committee Chair John Beuttler, Committee Jim Edgar, Committee Phil Havlicek (on phone), Committee John Ryzanych, Committee Bob Strickland (by phone), Committee

Gary Adams, CSBA

Sonke Mastrup, DFG Neil Manji, DFG Heather McIntire, DFG Helen Birss, DFG

Minutes

There were no minutes for review.

Action Log Items

- 58 Agenda: DFG staff will discuss the biggest opportunities and biggest problems within the BDSEFES geographic range. There are no "biggest issue" topics on today's agenda.
- 64 & 70 Striped Bass Stamp Fund Update; Ask Striped Bass Stamp Fund advisory committee to consider a press release discussing the strong striper season and how population composition. The Striped Bass Stamp Fund Advisory Committee has not met.
- 73 Julie Oltmann's Bill Update. There are no legislative updates at this time.
- 76, 78, 83 and 97 The Fisheries Advocate subcommittee will determine the need and role of a fisheries advocate; Add to agenda: Fisheries Advocate subcommittee report; Add to Agenda: Discussion of needs, role, and job description of the fisheries consultant; Add fisheries consultant to January meeting. Discussion of a Fisheries Consultant is postponed.
- 80 Provide Committee with a financial overview at each meeting. No activities to report.

- 81 Add to agenda: New Project Ideas. New Project Ideas is on the agenda.
- 82 Provide Committee with a financial overview at each meeting. A financial overview was included in your meeting packet.
- 84 and 85 Invite the head of the Fish Salvage Program to the next BDSFES meeting; Invite Dan Odenweller to discuss his striped bass work. Striped bass presentations have been postponed.
- 86 Create a project tracking spreadsheet. A project tracking system is underway.
- 88 Get copy of AB 1574, find out if it is signed and send to Committee. AB 1574 was included in the meeting packet and is an agenda item.
- 89 Provide the Committee a copy of AB 2773 and include on the next agenda. AB 2273 was included in the meeting packet and is an agenda item.
- 90 Provide financial status report for the Central Valley Angler Survey, anticipated long-term costs, and the SFRA cost-share at the January meeting. A Central Valley angler survey update will be at a future meeting.
- 91 The BDSFES trailer Bill was signed and a copy was included in your meeting packet. The trailer bill clarified existing language and did not make any changes.
- 92 E-mail to the Committee the Angler Access RFP. The Angler Access RFP was e-mailed to the Committee.
- 93 Add to agenda for Jan/Feb meeting to discuss Sturgeon Punch Card funding when the FGC meeting makes a decision. The Sturgeon Punch Card will be discussed today.
- 94 Add WCB projects to November agenda. The WCB projects are on today's agenda.
- 95 Ask Bob Hullbrock his thoughts on a sturgeon fillet tag program. Bob Hullbrock says there is a sturgeon-invoicing program that tracks fillets. It does not address issues associated with roe.

Sonke – The BDSFES Advisory Committee's role is to recommend projects; we are not looking for advice about the proposal. Sturgeon are an important issue to the DFG and we are working with enforcement, fisheries branch, region and the Commission on what actions to take. Angler sturgeon tags are part of the plan and will be funded wholly or in part by BDSFES funds. The role of the BDSFES Advisory Committee is not to veto or direct policy, but to recommend expenditures.

The Executive Group has been talking about advisory committees in general and we are re-evaluating all committees and their primary goals. Are we doing what we have been tasked to do or are we straying? The job of this Advisory Committee is to review projects and come up with projects that benefit anglers

and fisheries within the BDSFES geographic range. I want to ensure we stay focused. Other issues such as water exports are informational but are we still on task? What can we change to ensure we stay on task?

After each meeting, Neil has a debriefing meeting with Sonke and the Director. There was a discussion about the Committee's discussion on changing sturgeon legislation and the press release. The press release was released without DFG consent. Both Sonke and the Director expressed concerns about keeping this committee focused on its task.

It would be beneficial for the Department to provide written proposals so that the Committee can see our commitment to and the reasons why we think a project is an appropriate expenditure. We need to formalize our deliberation and discussions in writing. Management and the Director discuss these issues and then the discussions need repeating at the committee level. Many of these discussions have been settled and a formalized method to track the discussions would benefit everyone involved. This would also benefit us when these discussions come up again in five years.

As for sturgeon, the Committee wanted to know if the forensic proposal is a wise expenditure. Are there better ways to spend the money? Does enforcement already have a system to monitor market fish?

It is the roe, not the fillets that present the issue. The roe are much more difficult to track and the forensic proposal would assist in tracking roe violations.

The sturgeon punch card is necessary because we need more data. Sturgeon have been monitored for many years and we have a consistent way to count them; however, the additional information provided by the punch card will enable us to calculate a stronger abundance estimate. The punch card will provide information on take and will provide secondary population information. Sturgeon are a unique fishery and they are challenging to sample. The additional information provided by the sturgeon punch card will be an asset in understanding sturgeon.

Bob Strickland says that at the Fish and Game Commission meeting, many anglers expressed support for sturgeon stocking. He does not believe the Department should build more hatcheries; however, there are local hatcheries that can produce sturgeon for stocking at approximately \$10.00 per fish.

Phil Havlicek participated by phone and was unable to stay for the entire meeting. He stated that he stands behind the press release, Delta enhancement through stocking, and what was voted on at the last committee meeting. Phil authorized John Beuttler to discuss this on his behalf. The Committee's hands have been tied for the last two years, so let's do some projects.

Gary Adams (CSBA) believes angler information is important and that the commercial /recreational logbooks provide this information. At the last Fish and Game Commission meeting, we provided the Department's logbooks with information on time and locations where fish were caught, fish size, etc., and were told that the information was not pertinent. It seems like it should be. John Beuttler notes that captains are required to submit vessel fishing logs and to be honest with the information they provide, but there is no way to verify the information. It has value but it is limited.

If the Commission recognizes the vessel logbooks are a slice of the information pie, the sturgeon punch cards will add another level of data to review. We are at the formative stage. It is time to change how we monitor and manage sturgeon and we will spend some money on getting a sturgeon plan in place. We need to put more energy into the fishery.

• ACTION ITEM: Find the resolution process.

It may not be appropriate for the Committee to have a resolution process because it changes the role from an advisory committee to something else. You are an advisory body. We need to have a written proposal with the Committee's yea or nea. We need to document all these decisions and discussions so that we can track what decisions were made and why. That written documentation should also include the Director's response. There is not going to be a formal resolution process.

ACTION ITEM: Remove the last action item.

John Beuttler disagrees. If you don't want organizational support, then go down this path. You need to provide that opportunity to discuss with the Director.

This is why there needs to be a written proposal. The proposal can include the constituents' needs and the Committee's decision. Then the Director can review the written proposal with all the information and make his own decision.

John Beuttler believes the process needs to be in writing too. I think this written process is very important and we are open to discuss changes you think are necessary. Having the process in writing is very important.

The relationship between the Advisory Committee and the Department is loose. I think going to written documentation will help. The DFG needs to bring things to the Committee in writing too. It provides a formal process for how the Committee came up with proposals/priorities/ etc. on record.

- ACTION ITEM: Make a cover page and support documentation for the Director's signature that includes the following:
 - Proposal
 - o Committee's position
 - o The Department's response
 - Attached data
 - Final outcome
- 96 The PSN criteria have been updated and it is an agenda item.
- 98 The press release is on today's agenda.

Proposal Solicitation Notice Process

The Proposal Solicitation Notice (PSN) process is an annual process used by the Fisheries Restoration Grant Program to solicit a broad range of projects. This process is annual and highly documented - it could provide the documentation that Sonke is talking about. It follows all the rules and functions as a Request For Proposal (RFP). It lets people know there is money out there for very specific projects. It is a legal document and each proposal goes through a two phase review process. This process is more efficient than going through individual RFPs or going to bid. A PSN is more flexible than a RFP. We ask for specific types of proposals, the proposals are reviewed by a technical review team (TRT) and an advisory group, decisions are made and we write the contract. The PSN can be focused on the Committee's priorities.

If the Committee wants to pursue a specific project with a specific group, another process would be more appropriate. Then you would want to do an Invitation to Bid or similar process. The purpose of the PSN is to gather many proposals for a large range of projects.

The PSN review process is detailed in the PSN itself - including all of the evaluation criteria. A numeric scoring system is necessary to keep the decisions from becoming subjective. The more the subjective a decisions is, the more likely it can be stopped by the appeal process.

It is important that the Committee focus on the scoring criteria that they will use. The Committee may want to consider a working meeting to determine their priorities and to review and refine their scoring criteria. John B. notes the Committee needs its own process for this. The Committee established another process with criteria.

Those criteria can be included in the Committee's scoring. Once the PSN is published, scoring criteria can not be changed. This is a once a year process.

Once the Department has received all the proposals, they begin the review process. First it is determined if the proposals have met all of the PSN requirements. Those that have met the PSN requirements go to the TRT. The

TRT reviews each project for feasibility and technical accuracy. Then the proposals go to the Advisory Committee. Your group will rank each proposal based on the information from the technical review and your evaluation criteria. Then you rank the projects based on the technical review and your decisions. Your ranking will move forward to the Director for his approval.

The last PSN went to 1,400 people on the PSN mailing list. The PSN is also advertised and announced when it is published. The Committee can provide mailing addresses for anyone it thinks would be interested in receiving the information. Heather has started a list of people to include and you can contact her with any additional people you would like added to the list.

We anticipate the PSN will go out in February.

The Committee can review the BDSFES portion of the PSN.

There is an issue as to what our priorities are. Statue gives us a scope in area and types of projects. Our goal is to narrow it to encompass things that matter. There are going to be areas of special interest. The Committee's priorities can be included in the PSN's narrative portion.

<u>Current Proposed BDSFES Projects</u>

The Wildlife Conservation Board could potentially fund the entire Clarksburg project if necessary. The Knight's Landing project is outside their funding limits. Yolo County is applying for funding elsewhere to make up the deficient.

The City of Redding's Turtle Bay project is a good cost-share.

The Knight's Landing fish cleaning station is something that is tangible and good for anglers.

Bob Strickland – These projects are going to benefit a lot of people. These projects provide for more access and that is one of our tasks. The amount we are spending is minimal and I think we should look at doing something now to show people that it is worth money to buy the stamp.

Jim Crenshaw – I think that we ought to try to do some things that are legitimate and visible to show that we are working on something. I like the Redding proposal because it is upstream and provides access. There are few things that will benefit fly anglers and this is one thing. That is also why I supported the black bass boat; there are few things we can do to benefit black bass anglers. I am sympathetic to access when cost is low, we piggy back with other money, and anglers benefit. I have misgivings about the Rio Vista project, because of the technical aspects (it might be flooded out again). I am supportive of these projects.

John Beuttler – I have two issues. Parking is an issue. I share Jim and Bob's sentiment, but I am not willing to do anything just because it looks good. They need to look good and do good.

Knight's Landing - fish cleaning station, fish cleaning platform. John Beuttler recommends funding those items. Around \$33,400.

Clarksburg - fish cleaning station - \$41,750.

The projects should require, in writing, who will maintain the project in the long-term.

Rio Vista - The Rio Vista site has issues with potentially being flooded out again and they are asking the BDSFES to provide a high portion of the cost-share.

City of Redding - Jim Edgar supports this project. Bob Strickland also supports this project.

John Ryzanych – states that it is already being built and he hates to use the money for a project that is only useable 2 months a year. He thinks we have bigger projects in front of us. I think one of the purposes of the press release is to address issues that are important. Good project, but I will not vote for it.

Jim Crenshaw – This project is an upstream access project that we can do this fiscal year. We can still focus on major issues.

Jim Edgar – What you are raising is an issue of proportionality. Much of the funds that are coming in are from the Bay-Delta area. But money is coming in from upstream anglers and this is a small contribution for upstream users.

John Beuttler – It is a good value for the buy-in price.

Sonke asks who has access to the money? The POD stuff is big. This group does not control pumping, do not get lost in thinking that this money will be use to keep water from being pumped. That is a huge issue. We have been given a charge to help anglers while we can. The question is what can you do? Do not take on something larger than your or the Department's scope. Don't bypass good little projects because you want to slay the big dragon. You may not be able to slay the dragon ever.

John Ryzanych – Everyone I talk with wants more and bigger fish - that is all I hear.

Sonke – Some of these things we can not fix regardless of the amount of money. Each species has its own set of issues. We need to focus on what benefits we can provide for the amount of money we have.

Jim Edgar – Perhaps we could fund publicity. We could educate the public about the nature of the fisheries problems and acquaint the anglers with fisheries issues. Some funds could be directed to provide educational information and that might be a good start. We might not be able to fix the issues but we could educate the public on those issues.

Sonke – The Committee could determine specific educational needs. Then we can fund the staff to accomplish this task. Then anglers get more information and are better educated on fisheries issues.

Jim Edgar – The angler's understanding of the Delta is minimal. If you want to improve the support for the type of things that need to be done you need to educate anglers to develop that interest in larger issues.

Sonke – We can share facts easily. There may be an issue with including agendas, but facts we can do.

John Ryzanych – Suggests we postpone access projects until the Committee has determined its priorities.

MOTION - The Committee recommends funding the Knight's Landing project for \$33,400, the Clarksburg project for \$42,000, and the City of Redding project for \$50,000.

Motion amended to include: Fund those projects if once reviewed and approved by the Department.

Discussion - There are concerns that if we don't do these things we will likely not fund anything this fiscal year. The Department of Finance gave us spending authority, but now you are not going to spend it.

Amendment to motion: Ensure the projects have educational kiosks and that the Committee can review the information provided in those kiosks.

VOTE - All in favor except for John Ryzanych.

- ACTION ITEM: Talk with our education office about creating a strategy to
 educate anglers on the big issues facing fisheries. Ask them to come and
 talk with the Committee about developing that strategy.
- ACTION ITEM: The Committee and the Department will work to create a strategy to educate anglers about fisheries issues.

Press Release

The path for the press release was not clear. Decisions need to be documented through a vote. The Committee sending out a press release was not appropriate. All press releases will go through the Department, not the Committee.

Sonke – Press releases are incredibly sensitive issues and we get calls on them all the time. If you want a press release we can work together on one. The Committee can not issue a press release on your own.

The Funding Matrix

Sonke – Suggests using a matrix to help determine the Committee's funding priorities. The matrix worked on by the Committee is attached. It includes changes made after the meeting.

The Committee can decide ahead how much of the annual funding you would like to use for each project type. Then you can address each project type separately instead of against each other. Each project type can be ranked in order of importance

ACTION ITEM: Add funding matrix to next agenda.

SB1575

Senate Bill 1575 includes the creation of the strategic Delta vision. John B. would like to coordinate with the DFG to be included on the development of this strategic plan. Part of the Committee's goal is to enhance the fisheries and we need a sustainable fishery to do that. The Committee needs to ensure we get some informational reports on who is participating and what they are going to include in the strategic plan. Provide as an informational item on a regular basis.

 ACTION ITEM: Provide the Committee with updates on process and opportunities for input.

AB2773

John Beuttler – One issue here, that legislation required a one-time allocation for steelhead restoration projects. They high-jacked 800k.

The budget act is the most powerful law. This redirected money to a special project.

AB1803

Assembly Bill 1803 requires expenditure of these funds to be consistent with the CALFED ROD. The ROD was found not to be legal document. We already need to be consistent with ESA.

Project Ideas

None

New Business

Meeting Adjourned